IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE K. HEMA

WEDNESDAY, THE 7TH MARCH 2007 / 16TH PHALGUNA 1928

R.P(F.C). No. 18 of 2003

Against the order in MC.164/2000 dated 03.01.2003 of Family Court, Manjeri.

.....

REVISION PETITIONER/RESPONDENT:

KOZHISSERY ABDU, S/O. MOIDEEN,
KOZHISSERY HOUSE, MATTATHOOR P.O.,
OTHUKKUNGAL, MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI. BABU S. NAIR
SRI. RENJITH B. MARAR

RESPONDENTS: PETITIONERS & STATE:

----

1. **KUNHIPATHUMMA, D/O. HASSANKUTTY,**
   VAKEN HOUSE, THOKKANPARA, KOTTAKKAL P.O.,
   MALAPPURAM DISTRICT.

2. **SUMIAH, MINOR,**
   REPRESENTED BY MOTHER, GUARDIAN FIRST RESPONDENT.

3. **THE STATE OF KERALA,**
   REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
   HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM, KOCHI-31.

R1 BY ADV. SMT. K.V. RESHMI
SMT. C.S. SULEKHA BEEVI

THIS REV. PETITION (FAMILY COURT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 07/03/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

R.P(F.C). No. 18/2003

Order on Crl. M.P. No. 1892 of 2003 in R.P. (F.C.) No. 18 of 2003

Dismissed.

07.03.2007 **Sd/- K. HEMA, JUDGE.**

// TRUE COPY //

P.A. TO JUDGE.

smp

K. HEMA, J.

R.P. (F.C) NO. 18 OF 2003

Dated this the 7th day of March, 2007.

O R D E R

This revision petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Family Court.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that respondents 1 and 2 do not intend to execute the impugned order in the light of the settlement arrived at between the parties. It is stated that revision petitioner divorced first respondent and he paid all the amounts which he is liable to pay to first respondent and hence first respondent is not entitled to get any other amount from revision petitioner. It is also stated that revision petitioner has undertaken to meet all expenses for the higher studies of the minor child when she reaches 10th standard and also to meet all expenses for her marriage.

In the light of the above submissions, learned counsel appearing for revision petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not pressing this petition. But, he will seek his remedy before the trial court by filing a petition for cancellation of the order or seek other appropriate remedy. These submissions on both sides are recorded.

This petition is dismissed accordingly.

K. HEMA, JUDGE

smp